

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 22, 2010 has not been carefully studied. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 1 and 18 are allowed.

The Examiner as rejected claims 2-17 only under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although claim 1 was not rejected, applicant has amended this claim to assure consistency with the remaining claims which recite a process or device performing the process of the adhesive connection of sheets in the book-binding field by perforating the sheets along a "folding" edge.

Applicant has amended claim *y* to provide antecedent basis for the term "respective transversal slot". Additionally, applicant has amended this claim to make it clear that the transversal slots are part of the resulting cut line.

Applicant has amended claim 3 to specifically recite the fact that the folding edges are perforated using a perforating device.

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to indicate that the perforation lines are formed extending in a meander-type line or a dovetail-type line.

Claim 6 has been amended to indicate that the halves of the sheets subsequent to the punching step are still connected with each other by transversal "slots". Additionally, it is important to note that it is not absolutely necessary that the double sheets are still connected by hinge points or transversal slots. The meander-type or dovetail-type perforation lines force an interlocking of both sheets of the double sheet, so that there is no requirement for a connection by the transversal slots or hinge points. Therefore, it is believed that the subject matter in claim 6 does add a recitation to the process step of claim 1.

Claim 7 has been amended to specifically indicate that longitudinal slots of a perforation line are connected by transversal slots which are discontinuous to form hinge points.

Claim 8 has been amended to remove the recitation of the "pockets".

Claim 10 has been amended to indicate that the recesses are provided with a transition region.

Claim 11 has been amended to specify that the distance between the two perforation lines is altered dependent upon the thickness of the paper.

Claim 12 has been amended to eliminate the term "the transversal line" and claim transversal slots in a positive manner.

Claim 13 has been amended to require that the perforation teeth are staggered by the length of one perforating tooth in the longitudinal direction relative to each other along the folding edge in absence of longitudinal gaps.

Claim 14 has been amended to specifically indicate that transversal slots are in the perforation line.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite that the longitudinally extending cutting edges are partly cut through.


Claim 16 has been amended to recite transversal slots.

It is appreciated that the Examiner has indicated the claims 2-17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 USC §112 problems. It is believed that applicant has amended these claims to recite the invention in a definite manner. Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully urged.

It is believed that the claims presently in this application do define over the prior art in a definite manner. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/29/2000


Mitchell B. Wasson
Reg. No. 27,408

HOFFMAN, WASSON & GITLER, PC
2461 South Clark Street, Suite 522
Arlington, VA 22202
703.415.0100
Customer No. 20741

Attorney's Docket: A-9957.AMC/cat